



CA20N

Z 1

-66A22

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association

67 YONGE STREET, TORONTO 1, ONTARIO

October 26, 1966

The Honourable Mr. Justice George A. McGillivray,
Commissioner,
The Royal Commission on The Workmen's Compensation Act,
67 Richmond Street West,
Toronto 1, Ontario

Sir:

Accident Prevention

The subject of the prevention of accidents is one on which The Canadian Manufacturers' Association desires to be heard. Firstly, it must be said that The Association is not committed to any form or approach to accident prevention, whether it be by legislation with enforcement facilities; by organized labour in concert with management; by management alone; or by associations under the control of the Department of Labour, or the Workmen's Compensation Board. The important matter is that accidents be prevented and whatever approach can achieve this objective will be the one supported by this Association.

Definitely there is a need for legislation, inspection and enforcement of minimum safety standards for things of all kinds with which people live and work. Legislation, however, can do little to create the environment in which people will be motivated to work and live with these safe things without injury. The idea that rigid



VANCOUVER • EDMONTON • WINNIPEG • HAMILTON • TORONTO • OTTAWA • MONTREAL • QUEBEC • MONCTON

safety standards, with strict inspection and enforcement, will stop accidents is fallacious. Many Ontario manufacturers have safety standards far higher, more frequently inspected and more energetically enforced than any government bureau or the Workmen's Compensation Board could ever establish. Nevertheless, they still have accidents.

The idea that formal participation by organized labour in the field of accident prevention will solve the problem is equally fallacious. Many Ontario manufacturers have the full participation of their unions in accident prevention activities and they still have accidents.

The idea that placing all accident prevention work, including legislation and enforcement, under the direct supervision of the Workmen's Compensation Board will stop accidents, is just as fallacious. The reasons we feel this way will be developed as we proceed with our submission.

A good safety programme which obtains results can only be achieved by people dedicated to the objective of no accidents, and who have the skills, know-how, money and opportunity, and who apply them on a continuous basis. In many, many manufacturing establishments the physical hazards are a very minor factor. The major problem to be solved is the psychological one of safe work attitudes and habits at a time when society in general seems to admire the dare-devil and the risk-taker rather than the safety-minded individual.

Here, the psychological problem created by the 1963 change in the Workmen's Compensation Act, relative to the definition of an accident, and its interpretation, often jar to a halt those efforts towards the goal of no accidents which are created by a good accident prevention programme. The measure of accident prevention is accident frequency. This is determined by the number of accidents recognized

by the Workmen's Compensation Board per million man hours worked. The discouraging and deflating effect on management and employees who have embarked on a no-accident campaign when the Workmen's Compensation Board recognizes some disability with no related accident, must be experienced to be understood. The enthusiasm of the individual manager and his employees is dissipated and the momentum for the programme is lost. Tremendous efforts are needed to get it rolling again.

In this respect may we comment for a moment on material provided by the Workmen's Compensation Board at the request of the Commission. The Board's officials estimated that the change in the definition of an accident increased the number of claims allowed by 1.1% and the reduction in the waiting period increased claims 7.4%. In total this is an increase of 8.5% which is a significant increase in the number of claims recognized by the Board. We understand the cost of this 8.5% increase has been quoted as a total of \$635,725 which is not a great deal in comparison with the total expenditure on Workmen's Compensation.

It is a well known principle in the field of accident prevention that accident frequency is in the hands of man but severity is a matter of chance. For example, a wrench may be knocked from a factory catwalk, fall forty feet and strike someone a glancing blow on the shoulder, resulting in an accident of negligible severity. Ten inches to the left, the wrench would have hit the person on the head. Result: an accident; a cripple for life or even a fatality. The emphasis in accident prevention, therefore, is to prevent the wrench being knocked from the catwalk.

However, despite the statistics presented by the Workmen's Compensation Board, records available from the Industrial Accident Prevention Associations show the following:

ACCIDENT FREQUENCY SUMMARY

<u>Year</u>	<u>Firms Reporting</u>	<u>No. Of Employees</u>	<u>Hours Worked.</u>	<u>Frequency (Compensation cases per million hours)</u>
1957	1,240	372,951	739,482,113	14.57
1958	1,269	357,209	698,321,382	13.44
1959	1,410	363,219	727,985,861	14.58
				) Average 14.19
1960	1,487	367,089	731,893,270	13.57
1961	1,440	357,742	705,051,599	12.71
1962	1,450	376,322	749,950,128	13.69
				) Average 13.32
1963	1,342	387,109	774,838,463	16.22
1964	1,398	415,609	825,547,797	18.85
1965	1,478	454,783	901,120,343	20.62
				) Average 19.74

These statistics establish that at least up to the year 1963 progress was being made in the reduction of accident frequency. While there is some fluctuation in annual results you will note that the average for the three years of 1957, 1958, 1959 was a frequency of 14.19, whereas the average for the years 1960, 1961, 1962 was 13.32. In 1963 the definition of an accident and the reduction in the waiting time took place. Since that time the adverse impact in the field of accident prevention has been so great that the average for the years 1964 and 1965 jumped to 19.74. This is an increase of 48.2% over the average of the three years immediately prior to the change of the Act. To assist you in evaluating these statistics, may we point out that the number of employees covered is more than half of all the employees

in the 16 classes represented by I.A.P.A. and approximates one third of all the employees under Schedule 1. of the Act.

We have introduced this information because we wish to emphasize that the definition of an accident and the waiting period before compensation payments commence have a direct relationship to the success or failure of any accident prevention programme.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association respectfully submits that it is essential that an accident be clearly defined as being work-related and that the waiting period be sufficiently long and in terms of working days so that they no longer work against accident prevention.

Reduced to its very basic essentials, an accident prevention programme is concerned with two items: things and people. By things we mean plant and equipment, it is obvious that we do not have to define people.

The system of accident prevention in Ontario recognizes these fundamentals. Minimum standards for things are set out in legislation and are dealt with by the enforcement and inspection services of the Department of Labour and other government departments. The Workmen's Compensation Board is constituted to deal with people. To combine both of these aspects in one institution, whether it be government departments or the Board itself would, in our opinion, mix sand with sugar and achieve no good results. The Workmen's Compensation Board is world renowned as being people oriented. To have it become involved in things and enforcement procedures would destroy its image and seriously impair its effectiveness.

Concerning people, the results being achieved in the manufacturing industry, as indicated by the pre-1963 accident frequency figures quoted above, indicate the advantages of the educational accident prevention work by employer-sponsored safety associations. It is important to note that their work and enthusiasm also prompt a vast voluntary commitment

of people's time and effort in promoting safety. Added to this, for an employer, is the incentive to reduce Workmen's Compensation costs, by preventing accidents, and the desire to avoid heavy financial penalties which the Board is empowered to impose on employers with poor accident records.

We can see no advantage in transferring to the Workmen's Compensation Board the present activities of the Department of Labour, and other government agencies, in establishing the minimum safety standards for things, inspecting those things and providing penalties when inspections show the standards have not been met. The Workmen's Compensation Board deals with people and already has control of the employers' safety associations which are concerned with the safety education of people.

We note that in a submission presented to this Commission it has been suggested that the message of the employers' safety associations in the field of accident prevention has not filtered down to the work level. This, of course, is a matter of great concern to them.

In order to determine the effectiveness of their own programmes, the Industrial Accident Prevention Associations arranged for a survey to determine the effectiveness of a new television approach with which they had experimented on Channel 11, Hamilton. The survey was conducted by O.R.C. International Limited. Employees were interviewed on the job in both Hamilton and Toronto.

While we are authorized to file with you a copy of the complete report on the survey, we would like to quote three of the questions, together with the replies which are typical of the overall response in this survey.

Question No. 9.

On your job how do you learn about safety?

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Toronto</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>
Percentage base	391	180	211
Posters, signs, bulletins, books pamphlets	41%	39%	42%
Instructions, rules, lectures advice from foreman, etc.	37	41	33
Experience, mistakes	20	24	17
Learn by being careful	9	9	9
Safety Committee, safety programme	9	12	6
Scheduled meetings on safety	8	6	10
Common sense	6	9	4
Fellow workers	5	4	5
Safety inspection, checks	4	4	5
Movies on safety	3	1	4
Don't learn about safety, not necessary	3	2	4
Others	4	4	3
No opinion, did not state	2	0	3

Question No. 10

Thinking of the kind of advertising we've just been talking about, what organizations, associations or groups can you think of who might be behind or sponsor such advertising?

	<u>Total</u>
Percentage base	391
I.A.P.A.	32%
Company management	17
Service groups (Red Cross, St. John Ambulance)	16
Government	11
Safety and accident prevention groups	10
Workmen's Compensation Board	9
Motor organizations (OML)	4
Insurance Companies	3
Unions	2
Other	5
Don't know	23

Question No. 12

I am going to read a list of organizations. As I read each one I'd like you to tell me which of the statements on that card describes how well you know the organization. Just tell me the number.

	<u>Percentage Base</u>	<u>Know Very Well</u>	<u>Know Fairly Well</u>	<u>Know Just a Little</u>	<u>Never Heard of</u>
<u>Canadian Automobile Association</u>					
Total	391	22%	24	37	17
Toronto	180	18%	21	42	19
Hamilton	211	25%	26	33	16
<u>Construction Safety Association</u>					
Total	391	20%	19	35	26
Toronto	180	18%	21	29	32
Hamilton	211	22%	18	40	20
<u>Industrial Accident Prevention Associations</u>					
Total	391	48%	22	23	7
Toronto	180	48%	21	22	9
Hamilton	211	48%	24	23	5
<u>Ontario Motor League</u>					
Total	391	39%	25	27	9
Toronto	180	41%	25	28	6
Hamilton	211	37%	26	25	12
<u>Ontario Safety League</u>					
Total	391	20%	20	38	22
Toronto	180	19%	19	37	25
Hamilton	211	21%	21	39	19

From Question No. 12 it will be noted that 70% replied that they knew the Industrial Accident Prevention Associations very well or fairly well.

These results suggest that the worker on the job knows the I.A.P.A. of Ontario, knows it is involved in the safety movement and, in fact, learns most about safety from the kind of educational endeavour which the I.A.P.A. conducts and is promoting through the management of each and every firm.

It is our belief that the best weapon in the fight against accidents

is a manager committed to the goal of no-accidents. Commitment can only be achieved by voluntary participation. The present employer safety associations provide the greatest possibility of obtaining this essential voluntary commitment. Even the International Labour Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, which has a world-wide view of safety efforts, is on record with the statement that the best results in this field are secured where the voluntary system flourishes.

The present method of utilizing employer safety associations has resulted in more voluntary participation in the field of accident prevention in the Province of Ontario than anywhere else in the world.

Only management has the responsibility under law to provide a safe work place. This is clearly set out in several Ontario Statutes which refer to safety. For example, the Industrial Safety Act states in ten separate places "the employer shall". In Regulations issued under the Act it says 47 times "the employer shall".

By law only management has the responsibility. Moreover management has the money and the skills to implement effective accident prevention policies. Management is influenced far more, in every phase of its operations, by its own commitment to achieve the highest result rather than by legislation of minimum standards.

We believe it would be a grave error to make any change which would divide responsibility or might shift responsibility to some area where the people or institutions involved are not able, or not willing, to accept the obligation that such responsibility entails.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. S. Keen
Manager, Ontario Division
Canadian Manufacturers' Association

